

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 44 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, new claim 59 is added, claims 1, 24, 40, 41, and 44 are amended, and claims 14-22, are withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1-13, 23-42, 45-57, and 59 are pending and under consideration.

Rejection of Claims 1, 24, 40 and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 24, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 24, 40, and 41 are amended to overcome this rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claim 2

The Office Action objects to claim 2 because claim 2 includes subject matter similar to some of the subject matter of claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to overcome this rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 23-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,046,276 issued to Hashimoto et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hashimoto"), in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0033333 to Suzuki et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Suzuki") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0012826 to Hattori et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hattori"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hashimoto, Suzuki, and Hattori, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the first and second housings each comprises an integral concave casing area covering the camera unit supported by the middle housing and positioned on a top portion of the first and second body housings," as recited in claims 1 and 24. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 24 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 2-6 and 23 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2-6 and 23 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 25-26 depend from claim 24 and include all of the features of claim 24. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 25-26 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 7-13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Suzuki and further in view of Hattori and U.S. Publication No. 2003/0117499 to Bianchi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Bianchi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hashimoto, Suzuki, Hattori, and Bianchi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the first and second housings each comprises an integral concave casing area covering the camera unit supported by the middle housing and positioned on a top portion of the first and second body housings," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 24 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 7-13 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 7-13 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 26-32 and 35-39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 26-32 and 35-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Suzuki in further view of Hattori and Bianchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hashimoto, Suzuki, Hattori, and Bianchi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the first and second housings each comprises an integral concave casing area covering the camera unit supported by the middle housing and positioned on a top portion of the first and second body housings," as recited in claim 24. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 24 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 26-32 and 35-39 depend from claim 24 and include all of the features of claim 24. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 26-32 and 35-39 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 33 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Suzuki in further in view of Hattori, Bianchi, and U.S. Patent No. 7,317,475 issued to Arai et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Arai"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hashimoto, Suzuki, Hattori, Bianchi, and Arai, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the first and second housings each comprises an integral concave casing area covering the camera unit supported by the middle housing and positioned on a top portion of the first and second body housings," as recited in claim 24. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 24 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 24 and include all of the features of claim 24. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 33 and 34 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 40-42, 44/41 44/42, 47-49, 52 and 57 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 40-42, 44/41 44/42, 47-49, 52 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Hattori. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 44 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Hashimoto in view of Hattori, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the first and second housings each comprises an integral concave casing area covering the camera unit supported by the middle housing and positioned on a top portion of the first and second body housings," as recited in claims 40 and 41. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 40 and 41 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 42, 47-49, 52, and 57 depend from claim 41 and include all of the features of claim 41. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 42, 47-49, 52, and 57 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 45 and 46 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Hattori in further view of Suzuki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hashimoto, Hattori, and Suzuki, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the first and second housings each comprises an integral concave casing area covering the camera unit supported by the middle housing and positioned on a top portion of the first and second body housings," as recited in claim 41. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 41 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 45-46 depend from claim 41 and include all of the features of claim 41. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 45-46 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 50, 51, and 53-56 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 50, 51 and 53-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Hattori in further view of Bianchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hashimoto, Hattori, and Bianchi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the first and second housings each comprises an integral concave casing area covering the camera unit supported by the middle housing and positioned on a top portion of the first and second body housings," as recited in claim 41. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 41 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 50, 51, and 53-56 depend from claim 41 and include all of the features of claim 41. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 50, 51, and 53-56 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1-13, 23-42, 45-57, and 59 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 2, 2009

By: 
Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501